

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 13 has been amended to overcome the informality noted by the Examiner.

It is submitted that independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Basu et al '733 ("Basu") for the reasons set forth below. It is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of this claim and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 21 calls for not aggregating completely some application-specific components of the data streams and then further transmitting the non-aggregated components at least in part as a separate data stream within the mobile communications network or alternatively via various network accesses to other telecommunication or data networks or to other receivers or the same receiver. Basu, on the other hand, discloses that the data received in the base station is assembled and decompressed and there is no suggestion whatsoever that the data is not aggregated completely or transmitted as a separate data stream within the network or via various network accesses. The fact that the multimedia data stream containing TCP/IP is passed to other circuitry within the base station does not meet the limitation of Claim 21 wherein the non-aggregated components are transmitted as a separate data stream within the mobile communications network.

Claim 21 defines a method that enables partial or complete transmission via parallel transmission, for example, in the ICAMU and the transmission to various communication partners via various network accesses, or, if the communication partner or the respective telecommunication network has comparable features, the separate transmission of multimedia data to the same communication partner. For example, take the situation where an IP connection with integrated IP telephony where the IP data are transmitted via the internet and the voice transmission is automatically decoupled along the transmission path and transmitted in parallel via circuit-switched telephone networks, and is finally reassembled for the customer application. The advantage of such a parallel transmission to the same user is to have an optimized utilization of the available communication channels and the available bandwidth, and so make the communication much faster and more reliable. This is not disclosed by nor possible with the method of Basu.

Claims 8 and 9 have been rewritten in independent form and it is submitted that they are not obvious over Basu. The Examiner acknowledges that Basu does not teach that the functional unit (base station 600) provides an additional service to the user by optional conversion of the data streams from the data streams from the user into other standardized

Application Serial No. 09/786,646
Amendment dated June 7, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2006

multimedia or protocol forms and then transmits them through alternative pathways and further does not teach handling routing and signaling mechanisms to transmit application or data structure of the specific parts of the multimedia data streams via various transmission networks.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Basu fails to teach that the functional unit (base station 600) performs a conversion of the data streams from one data format to another data format. It is correct, that Basu, Fig. 1, shows that the base station is connected to a PSTN and the Internet. However, it is not described that the base station performs a conversion of the data streams received from the user terminals. Basu shows in Figure 6, that the terminals may be connected to the base station 600 via several logical connections. Each logical connection may stand for a particular type of data with a particular data format. Basu fails to teach that a particular type data received in the base station is converted to another type of data. In fact, the data stream of a particular type and in a particular format is received in the base station and forwarded to the correct network, PSTN or Internet, supporting this kind of data, depending on the data format of the data stream.

For the reasons set forth above, it is clear that Claim 21 as well as Claims 8 and 9 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Basu. It is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

Application Serial No. 09/786,646
Amendment dated June 7, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2006

Although it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance, if the Examiner believes that further issues remain, it is requested that the undersigned be telephoned to discuss any suggestions that the Examiner might have.

Respectfully submitted,

John F. Hoffman
Registration No. 26,280
Attorney for Applicants

JFH/nw

BAKER & DANIELS
111 East Wayne Street, Suite 800
Fort Wayne, IN 46802
Telephone: 260-424-8000
Facsimile: 260-460-1700

Enc. Petition for Extension
of Time
Check No. 122592 (\$120.00)
Return Postcard

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on: June 7, 2006

JOHN F. HOFFMAN, REG. NO. 26,280

Name of Registered Representative

Signature

June 7, 2006

Date